



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,066

04/08/2004

Yoshiyuki Tamai

325772035900

7217

25227

7590

05/27/2009

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD

SUITE 400

MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

SAEED, USMAAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,066

Applicant(s)

TAMAI ET AL.

Examiner

USMAAN SAEED

Art Unit

2166

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 14-19, 23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 14-19, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 2/18/2009 is acknowledged.

None of the claims have been amended or cancelled. Claims 1-6, 14-19, and 23-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Takahashi et al. (Takahashi hereinafter)** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0035620) in view of **Shigeo Nara. (Nara hereinafter)** (U.S. PG Pub No.

2001/0017620) further in view of **Sasaki et al.** (**Sasaki** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 7,243,126).

With respect to claim 1, **Takahashi** teaches **an information processing apparatus comprising:**

“a memory unit which stores management table which contains information about states of a plurality of information processing apparatuses, wherein each of said plurality of information processing apparatuses are connected to a network” as a control system comprises a plurality of peripheral devices represented as objects, and a controller connectable to the plurality of peripheral devices via a common communication line for unitarily controlling the plurality of peripheral devices. The controller is arranged to be connected to an arbitrary number of peripheral devices selected from among the plurality of peripheral devices, read control information stored in the arbitrary number of peripheral devices via the communication line into a predetermined memory area of the controller in a predetermined format so that the controller can control the arbitrary number of peripheral devices. The controller is also arranged to issue a command and transmit the command to each of the arbitrary number of peripheral devices via the communication line (**Takahashi** Abstract and figures 2a-2c and 64 and Paragraph 0300).

“an updating controller which updates said states of the information processing apparatuses in said management table” as (Takahashi Paragraphs 0307, 0318-0019, 0331, and 0341-0342).

“a display unit which displays updated state of the information processing apparatuses” as (Takahashi Paragraphs 0301, 0331, 0343 and 0358).

Takahashi teaches the elements of claim 1 as note above but does not explicitly disclose **“plurality of shared image folders,” “a search controller which executed searching of said shared folder,” “a comparator which compares folder of the present search with those of the last search.”**

However, Nara discloses **“a search controller which executed searching”** as (Nara Figure 3).

“a comparator which compares present search with those of the last search” as (Nara Paragraph 0054-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because Nara's teachings would have allowed Takahashi to provide an information processing apparatus, a network system, and a device-map display method which correctly and efficiently provide the user with the status information of a device connected to a network to allow the user to improve work efficiency (Nara Paragraph 0007).

Takahashi and Nara teaches the elements of claim 1 as noted above but do not teaches **“plurality of shared folders storing image data.”**

However, **Sasaki** discloses **“plurality of shared folders storing image data”** as a plurality of image data storing folders can be registered in each of the personal computers (**Sasaki** Col 12, Lines 65-67). Accordingly, image data read by the digital copying machine 1 can be stored in a private folder other than folders which an operating system on the personal computers publishes on the network as shared folders (**Sasaki** Col 14, Lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Sasaki’s** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi and Nara** to provide image shared folder by providing a push type scanner apparatus capable of transmitting image data to the selected destinations.

Claim 14 is same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 2, **Takahashi and Nara** do not explicitly teach **“a document reader which reads a document and outputs the image data”** and **“a communication controller which transmits image data to said shared folders.”**

However, **Sasaki** discloses **“a document reader which reads a document and outputs the image data”** and **“a communication controller which transmits image data to said shared folders”** as (**Sasaki** Col 1, Lines 58-67 and Col 14, Lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Sasaki's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi and Nara** to provide image shared folder by providing a push type scanner apparatus capable of transmitting image data to the selected destinations.

Claim 15 is same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 3, **Takahashi** teaches “**said states of a plurality of information processing apparatuses in said management table include a power ON/OFF state of each information processing apparatus**” as (**Takahashi** Paragraphs 0278, 0301-302, 0312, 0318-0019 and 0322).

“**said updated controller updates the power ON/OFF state of each information processing apparatus based on the result of the comparison made by said comparator**” as (**Takahashi** Paragraphs 0307, 0318-0019, 0331, and 0341-0342).

“**said display unit displays updated states of information processing apparatuses in a manner according to the updated power ON/OFF state of each information processing apparatus**” as (**Takahashi** Paragraphs 0301, 0331, 0343 and 0358).

Claim 16 is same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claims 4, **Takahashi** teaches “**wherein said search controller executes searching at intervals of first predetermined time**” as (Takahashi Paragraphs 0221, 0307, 0325, and 0335).

Claim 17 is same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 5, **Takahashi** teaches “**wherein said updating controller changes the power ON/OFF state of an information processing apparatus into off state**” as (Takahashi Paragraphs 0278, 0301-302, 0312, 0318-0019 and 0322).

Takahashi teaches the elements of claim 5 but does not explicitly teaches “**changing the power state into off state when the processing apparatus was found by last search but is not found by the present search.**”

However, **Nara** discloses “**changing the power state into off state when the processing apparatus was found by last search but is not found by the present search**” as it is determined in step S203 whether the "search thread" has been terminated or not. Whether the "search thread" has been terminated is determined by the state, ON or OFF, of the search termination flag disposed in the area shared by the "display thread" and the "search thread." When it is determined that the "search thread"

has not yet been terminated, the processing returns to step S202, the "display thread" enters the sleep state again, and the termination of the "search thread" is awaited. When it is determined in step S203 that the "search thread" has been terminated, the device map shown in FIG. 4 is re-displayed in the CRT 116 in step S204 according to the information stored in the HD 110, shown in FIG. 6, namely, the connection information and the use-condition information newly stored of all the devices on the network (**Nara** Paragraph 0049).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Nara's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashito** provide an information processing apparatus, a network system, and a device-map display method which correctly and efficiently provide the user with the status information of a device connected to a network to allow the user to improve work efficiency (**Nara** Paragraph 0007).

Claim 18 is same as claim 5 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 6, **Takahashi** teaches "**said display unit displays the updated states of the information processing apparatuses**" as (**Takahashi** Paragraphs 0301, 0331, 0343 and 0358).

Takahashi teaches the elements of claim 6 as noted above but does not explicitly teach **“a selection controller which allows selection of a destination to which image data is transmitted.”**

However, **Sasaki** discloses **“a selection controller which allows selection of a destination to which image data is transmitted”** as the present invention can transmit image data read by the push type scanner apparatus through a network to a desired personal computer only by operating the push type scanner apparatus without transmitting any operation command from the personal computer. In the push type scanner apparatus, for transmitting image data, a destination address is specified (**Sasaki** Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Sasaki's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi and Nara** to provide image shared folder by providing a push type scanner apparatus capable of transmitting image data to the selected destinations.

Claim 19 is same as claim 6 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

3. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Takahashi et al.** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0035620) in view of **Shigeo Nara.** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2001/0017620) further in view of **Sasaki et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,243,126) as

applied to claims 1-6, and 14-19 above, further in view of **Koichi Tamura (Tamura hereinafter)** (Patent No. 7,027,427).

With respect to claim 23, **Takahashi** teaches the controller searching at intervals of predetermined time as noted in the above claims but **Takahashi, Nara and Sasaki** do not explicitly teach “**search time intervals of a second predetermined time shorter than the first predetermined time.**”

However, **Tamura** teaches “**search time intervals of a second predetermined time shorter than the first predetermined time**” as a cell search method in a CDMA system comprises the steps of monitoring a communication stop time interval, of carrying out a cell search processing using a previous cell search result when the communication stop time interval is shorter than a first threshold time interval (**Tamura Paragraph 0023**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Tamura's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi, Nara and Sasaki** to provide a cell search method for a CDMA which is capable of carrying out a cell search processing at a high speed by using a previous cell search result and to provide a cell search method for CDMA of the type described, which is capable of decreasing consumed power in the cell search processing (**Tamura Col 3, Lines 55-65**).

Claim 24 is same as claim 23 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 02/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Takahashi, Nara, and Sasaki do not teach or suggest **“a shared folder management table which contains information about a plurality of shared folders and states of a plurality of information processing apparatuses associated with the shared folder”** and **“a search controller which executes searching of said shared folders.”**

In response to the preceding arguments examiner respectfully submits that Takahashi teaches **“a management table which contains information about states of a plurality of information processing apparatuses”** as a control system comprises a plurality of peripheral devices represented as objects, and a controller connectable to the plurality of peripheral devices via a common communication line for unitarily controlling the plurality of peripheral devices. The controller is arranged to be connected to an arbitrary number of peripheral devices selected from among the plurality of peripheral devices, read control information stored in the arbitrary number of peripheral devices via the communication line into a predetermined memory area of the controller in a predetermined format so that the controller can control the arbitrary number of peripheral devices. The controller is also arranged to issue a command and

transmit the command to each of the arbitrary number of peripheral devices via the communication line (**Takahashi** Abstract and figures 2a-2c and 64 and Paragraph 0300). Therefore, these lines teach a management table which stores the power on/off states of the connected devices.

Nara teaches **“a search controller executing searches”** as (**Nara** Figure 3). Figure 3 of Nara teaches the search thread which search for the connection information of all devices and stores it in the table as shown in figure 6.

Further, **Sasaki** discloses **“plurality of shared folders storing image data”** as a plurality of image data storing folders can be registered in each of the personal computers (**Sasaki** Col 12, Lines 65-67). Accordingly, image data read by the digital copying machine 1 can be stored in a private folder other than folders which an operating system on the personal computers publishes on the network as shared folders (**Sasaki** Col 14, Lines 61-65). Sasaki contains plurality of devices each having image data folders and these folders get published on the network as shared folder having shared destination data.

Therefore the combination of these shared folders being stored on plurality of devices of Sasaki, along with the searches being performed to find the current state of the devices as taught by Nara and the managements table of Takahashi which stores the information about the devices, teaches the invention as a whole.

Further applicant argues that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine these references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Nara's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi** to provide an information processing apparatus, a network system, and a device-map display method which correctly and efficiently provide the user with the status information of a device connected to a network to allow the user to improve work efficiency (**Nara** Paragraph 0007). Further it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Sasaki's** teachings would have allowed **Takahashi and Nara** to provide image shared folder by providing a push type scanner apparatus capable of transmitting image data to the selected destinations (**Sasaki** Abstract).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to USMAAN SAEED whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Usmaan Saeed/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
May 25, 2009

Usmaan Saeed
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2166

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166